

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 11-13 and 16-17 remain pending in this application after entry of this paper. The invention is believed to be patentable. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 11 to more particularly point out the invention. Specifically, the amended claims recite that the request from the computer system takes a form of an ongoing natural language dialog between the computer system and the human teacher with the computer system having a list of ways to ask questions with a variable for the questionable data.

Previously presented claims 1-2 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,044) in view of Beutnagel (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,885).

Amended claim 1 recites a method of training a computer system via human voice input from a human teacher. The computer system has a text to speech engine and a speech recognition engine. The computer system presents a text spelling of an unknown word and requests to receive the human voice pronunciation of the unknown word using speech output. The request from the computer system takes a form of an ongoing natural language dialog between the computer system and the human teacher. The computer system has a list of ways to ask questions with a variable for the questionable data. The computer system then receives a human voice pronunciation of the unknown word from the human teacher. A phonetic spelling of the unknown word is determined with the speech recognition engine based on the human voice pronunciation of the unknown word. The text spelling is associated with the phonetic spelling to allow the text to speech engine to correctly pronounce the unknown word in the future when presented with the text spelling of the unknown word.

It is appreciated that the invention comprehends an ongoing natural language dialog between the computer system and the human teacher with the computer system having a list of ways to ask questions with a variable for the questionable data. The Examiner acknowledges that Baker does not specifically suggest the recited ongoing dialog feature. The

Examiner relies on secondary reference Beutnagel as suggesting the modification of Baker to achieve the claimed invention. However, Beutnagel fails to address the deficiency of Baker and there is no suggestion to combine the references to achieve the claimed invention.

*original doesn't have a list of ways to ask questions*

The Examiner makes reference to Beutnagel and notes that a dialog between the computer and user consists of multiple states that continue until a word has been correctly entered, and asserts that this teaching is the functional equivalent of the claimed limitation. Applicant disagrees. As amended, the language of claim 1 specifies that there is an ongoing natural language dialog and a computer system has a list of ways to ask questions with a variable for the questionable data. It is appreciated that this feature enables human teaching of semi-intelligent computer systems wherein the computer may be used to ask human teachers questions and accept input from the human teacher to improve performance of the computer system.

Beutnagel fails to suggest the particulars of the recited ongoing natural language dialog. Beutnagel only suggests that the system may ask the end-user to record another example of the target word, and then re-run recognition steps. This teaching fails to suggest the particular recited ongoing natural language dialog as set forth in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

Claim 11 has also been amended to more particularly point the invention, and it is believed to be patentable for the same reasons as given for claim 1. Claims 2 and 12 are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

Claims 3 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Beutnagel further in view of Franceschi (U.S. Patent No. 6,321,196). These claims are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

Claims 6-7 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Beutnagel and further in view of Surace et al. (U.S. Patent

No. 6,144,938). These claims are believed to recite further patentable subject matter that is not suggested by the cited prior art. For example, claim 6 recites a plurality of request statements with a range of information content levels wherein a plurality of request statements are used by the computer system during the ongoing dialog. Claim 7 further specifies that in the ongoing dialog, the information content level is progressively lessened as presenting, receiving, determining, and associating are repeated. Claims 16 and 17 also recite these features.

*non  
analogous*

The Examiner relies on secondary reference Surace as suggesting the incorporation of these information content level features with teachings of the other references to achieve the claimed invention. Surace is believed to be non-analogous art. Applicant's invention relates to a method of training a computer system via human voice input from a human teacher, with the computer including a speech recognition engine. Specification, page 1, lines 5-8. On the other hand, Surace is in a different field and relates to voice user interfaces with personality. The particular problem solved by Applicant's invention is the problem of training a large concatenated voice system. Surace is not in the same field of the invention, and does not commend itself to the attention of one dealing with the problem of training a large concatenated voice system. Surace only describes voice user interfaces having personality. Surace is believed to be non-analogous art; there is no motivation to combine these references to achieve the claimed invention.


S/N: 09/871,524  
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2005

Atty Dkt No. 1813 (USW 0611 PUS)

Lastly, claims 8-10 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Conrad. Applicant has canceled claims 8-10 and 18-20.

Respectfully submitted,

**ELIOT M. CASE**

By   
Jeremy J. Curcuri  
Reg. No. 42,454  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: May 9, 2005

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351